

would readily understand, a signaling message consists of signaling information that is transferred as an entity.

For example Wikipedia, (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Signalling\\_%28telecommunication%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Signalling_%28telecommunication%29)) explains that, in telecommunication, signaling refers to the use of signals for controlling communications. More specifically, in a telecommunications network, signaling refers to the information exchange concerning the establishment and control of a connection and the management of the network, in contrast to user information transfer. Further, signalling is also deemed to be the sending of a signal from the transmitting end of a circuit to inform a user at the receiving end that a message is to be sent.

Nevertheless, none of these conventionally understood definitions of signaling corresponds to checking whether a mobile station has the most up-dated version of operating software, as in Criss. Furthermore, checking operating software version does not correspond to a signaling message.

Additionally, Applicant submits that Criss, analyzed individually or in combination with the other cited prior art, does disclose, teach or suggest tracing signalling messages. Tracing means finding something or following something. To the contrary, the term “checking,” particularly as it is used in Criss, merely refers to examining something or confirming something. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that Criss’s checking whether a mobile station has the most updated version of operating software does not constitute the claimed tracing of signaling messages.

Even assuming for argument’s sake only that Criss’s host could correspond to the claimed functional entity and that Criss’s mobile terminal could correspond to a subscriber whose signaling messages are to be traced, further explanation must be provided regarding how Criss, analyzed individually or in combination with the other cited prior art, could possibly teach or suggest the claimed tracer to which the copies of signaling messages are sent.

Furthermore, because Criss’s information exchange occurs between the mobile terminal and the host, Criss’s actually teaches away from the claimed invention in which a copy of a message is sent to the tracer in response to reception or transmission of a signaling message related to the subscriber to be traced.

Furthermore, Criss’s boot up table does not contain any messages; rather, the boot up table merely contains a hardware address for each mobile terminal, an IP address and a boot file called package name indicating which package definition file shall be used with the mobile terminal (see chapters 0054-0057). Each package definition file contains a version identifier for

the operating software, an indication indicating of the total memory occupied by the operating software and an indicator of a download mode for the operating software, directory path in the mobile terminal and a directory path in an FTP server, information relating to file type and indication should the file to be stored to ROM or RAM. However, none of these stored pieces of information relates to signaling messages.

As explained previously, Sanmugam merely teaches that signaling may convey information on various mobile activities (column 25, lines 59-60) and that activities are traced. However, Sanmugam clearly teaches that a signaling message does not correspond to an activity. Accordingly, Sanmugam merely teaches to trace activities, whereas the claimed invention relates to tracing signaling messages. Thus, Sanmugam fails to teach or suggest sending a tracing command identifying at least one subscriber whose signaling messages are to be traced.

Clarke similarly fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Criss because Clark merely teaches that, upon monitoring, information on the monitored message is stored (Fig 4 in Clarke) and this collected functionality information is sent in a probe report message (column 10, lines 47-50). Thus, Clarke teaches excerpting information from signaling messages and periodically sending this excerpted information. However, this excerption and periodic sending of a subset of message information does not constitute sending a copy of a signaling message in response to the reception or transmission of a signaling message.

As a result, the combined teachings of Criss with either Sanmugam and Clarke fail to disclose, teach or suggest sending, to the tracer, a copy of a signalling message in response to the reception or transmission of a signalling message related to the subscriber to be traced, wherein the copy of the signalling message sent to the tracer is identical to the signalling message of the subscriber. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are patentable over the cited prior art.

All objections have been addressed. If anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

EINAMO -- 09/762,922  
Client/Matter: 060258-0277084

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY

Reg. No. 41844

Tel. No. 703 770.7743

Fax No. 703 770.7901

Date: June 14, 2006  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-7900